

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-46 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-46 are patentable over the art of record and allowance is respectfully requested of claims 1-46.

In paragraph 5, claims 1-12, 14-25, 27-38, and 40-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell Borland "Microsoft Word 97" ("Borland reference"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Office Action cites page 297, lines 1-13, and page 117, lines 17-28 of the Borland reference as describing receiving at least one rule definition, wherein each rule definition indicates a find criteria, a replacement value, and an input data column in the input table. Page 297, lines 1-13, of the Borland reference describes an insert table command, which only creates a new table. If the insert table command is described as a rule definition, since the insert table command does not specify a find criteria, a replacement value, and an input data column in the input table, the insert table command teaches away from the claimed rule definition. Also, page 117, lines 17-28, of the Borland reference describes a replace command, which finds text and replaces the found text with new text. Even if combined, the cited two commands (insert table and replace) teach away from Applicants' one rule definition that indicates find criteria, a replacement value, and an input data column in an input table.

Also, the Office Action cites page 117, lines 17-28, as describing, if the rule definition does not specify an output table, directly inserting, for each rule definition, the replacement value in the fields in the input data column that match the find criteria. Page 117, lines 17-28, merely describes a replace command, but there is no determination of whether an output table is specified in the rule definition. Also, neither the insert table command nor the replace command allow specification of an output table, so they can not teach or suggest if the rule definition does not specify an output table, directly inserting, for each rule definition, the replacement value in the fields in the input data column that match the find criteria.

Therefore, claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the Borland reference.

Claims 14, 27, and 40 are not taught or suggested by the Borland reference for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-12, 15-25, 28-38, and 41-46 depend from independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 40 and add additional novel elements. Therefore, claims 2-12, 15-25, 28-38, and 41-46 are not taught or suggested by the Borland reference for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1, 14, 27, and 40.

In paragraph 6, claims 13, 26, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell Borland "Microsoft Word 97" ("Borland reference") in view of Dahlen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,421). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Dahlen patent does not overcome the deficiencies of the Borland reference. For example, the Dahlen patent does not teach or suggest receiving at least one rule definition, wherein each rule definition indicates a find criteria, a replacement value, and an input data column in the input table; searching, for each rule definition, the input data column for any fields that match the find criteria; and, if the rule definition does not specify an output table, directly inserting, for each rule definition, the replacement value in the fields in the input data column that match the find criteria, wherein subsequent applications of additional rule definitions applied to the same input data column operate on replacement values inserted in the input data column in previously applied rule definitions. Therefore, claims 1, 14, 27, and 40 are not taught or suggested by the Borland reference or the Dahlen patent, either alone or in combination.

Dependent claims 13, 26, and 29 depend from independent claims 1, 14, and 27 and add additional novel elements. Therefore, claims 13, 26, and 29 are not taught or suggested by the Borland reference or the Dahlen patent, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1, 14, and 27.

Additionally, the Dahlen patent describes a cleanup process for a lock structure (Abstract), while the Borland reference describes the Word 97 application. There is no

motivation to combine these references. Also, even if combined, cleaning a lock structure is not equivalent to rule definitions including a row clean flag, and wherein at least one rule definition has the row clean flag set, and removing any row including a field matching the search criteria from the input table when the row clean flag is set.

Thus, claims 13, 26, and 29 are not taught or suggested by the Borland reference or the Dahlen patent, either alone or in combination.

### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-46 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: November 14, 2003

By: Janaki K. Davda  
Janaki K. Davda  
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor  
Konrad Raynes Victor & Mann, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: 310-553-7977  
Fax: 310-556-7984